

OLL 85-3893

Office of Legislative Liaison
Routing Slip

TO:	ACTION	INFO
1. D/OLL		x
2. DD/OLL		x
3. Admin Officer		
4. Liaison [redacted]		x
5. Legislation	x	
6. [redacted]		x
7. [redacted]		
8. [redacted]		
9. [redacted]		
10. [redacted]		
SUSPENSE		20Dec85 Date

Action Officer:	[redacted]
Remarks:	[redacted]

[redacted] 18Dec85
Name/Date



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON
85-3893

December 16, 1985

STC/6/11

LEGISLATIVE REFERRAL MEMORANDUM

TO:

LEGISLATIVE LIAISON OFFICER

SEE ATTACHED DISTRIBUTION LIST

SUBJECT: Department of Justice draft report on S. 1815, the
Polygraph Protection Act of 1985.

The Office of Management and Budget requests the views of your agency on the above subject before advising on its relationship to the program of the President, in accordance with OMB Circular A-19.

Please provide us with your views no later than December 20, 1985.

Direct your questions to Branden Blum (395-3454), the legislative attorney in this office.

for

James C. Murr for
Assistant Director for
Legislative Reference

Enclosure

DISTRIBUTION LIST

<u>AGENCY</u>	<u>CONTACT</u>	<u>PHONE NUMBE</u>
Department of Agriculture (01)	Sid Clemans	382-1516
Department of Commerce (04)	Mike Levitt	377-3151
Department of Defense (06)	Werner Windus	697-1305
Department of Education (07)	JoAnne Durako	732-2670
Department of Energy (09)	Bob Rabben	252-6718
Department of Health and Human Services (14)	Frances White	245-7750
Department of Housing and Urban Development (15)	Ed Murphy	755-7240
Department of the Interior (16)	Norma Perry	343-6797
Department of Labor (18)	Seth Zinman	523-8201
Department of State (25)	Lee Berkenbile	632-0430
Department of Transportation (26)	John Collins	426-4694
Department of the Treasury (28)	Carole Toth	566-8523
Environmental Protection Agency (08)	Stead Overman	382-5200
Federal Emergency Management Agency (10)	Spence Perry	646-4105
General Services Administration (13)	Ted Ebert	566-1250
NASA (19)	Toby Costanzo	453-1080
Office of Personnel Management (22)	Bob Moffit	632-6516
United States Postal Service (11)	Fred Eggleston	268-2958

Central Intelligence Agency

National Security Council

Office of Science & Technology Policy

cc: Fred Fielding
John Cooney
Karen Wilson
Phil Hanna
Arnold Donahue
Lisa Berger



Office of Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs

Office of the Assistant Attorney General

Washington, D.C. 20530

The Honorable Orrin G. Hatch
Chairman, Committee on Labor and
Human Resources
United States Senate
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Mr. Chairman:

The purpose of this letter is to submit the views of the Department of Justice regarding S. 1815, the proposed "Polygraph Protection Act of 1985." With the following modifications to Section 8, the Department of Justice would not oppose the enactment of this legislation.

The bill would prohibit the administration of polygraph examinations by private sector employers to employees or prospective employees. Section 8 of the bill exempts individuals employed by federal, state and local governments. In addition, this section permits the Department of Defense to administer polygraph tests, pursuant to the program outlined in the Department of Defense Authorization Act for 1986, to personnel of its contractors who have access to classified information. The Department of Justice shares the Senate's concern regarding the sensitive nature of the activities performed by many Department of Defense contractors and agrees that an exemption for contractor employees engaged in such activities is justified. This type of contracting is not, however, limited to the Department of Defense. Other Executive agencies and departments engage contractors to perform functions that are directly related to intelligence and other national security matters. The justifications for a Department of Defense exemption are equally persuasive when applied to the national security related contracts of these other agencies and departments. The Department of Justice, therefore, recommends a broader exemption that would extend also to employees of contractors for these other agencies and departments, provided that the employee has actually been identified as requiring access to classified information before being subjected to a polygraph examination.

- 2 -

In lieu of Section 8 of S. 1815, the Department of Justice proposes the following:

Exemptions

Sec. 8:

The provisions of this Act shall not apply with respect to any individual who is employed by the United States Government, a state government, city, or any political subdivision of a state or city, nor shall this act prohibit the administration, in connection with the performance of any function requiring access to classified information, of a polygraph examination to personnel of a contractor to the Central Intelligence Agency, the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, the Department of State, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Security Agency, the Treasury Department, or other federal agencies or departments whose contractors require access to classified information.

This version of Section 8 would address the concerns of executive agencies engaged in sensitive governmental functions and simultaneously protect the privacy interests of employees by ensuring that access to classified information is the prerequisite to administering a polygraph examination.

In addition to the concern cited above, we note that the language of Sections 3(1) and 3(2) of the bill is extremely broad and extends beyond the stated purposes. In its present form, this legislation would not only prohibit employers from requiring, requesting, or suggesting that employees or prospective employees submit to polygraph examinations in connection with their employment, but would also prohibit the employer from permitting an employee to submit to such tests for any purpose. This language could be construed to place an affirmative duty on an employer to prevent employees, or even prospective employees, from submitting to such examinations by any person for any purpose, lest the employer be subject to the enforcement provisions of Section 7. Because the stated purpose of the bill is "to prevent the denial of employment opportunities based on the use of lie detectors," the Justice Department is concerned that the present language may overstep these objectives. The prospect of being in violation of the bill's provisions simply by not preventing an employee from submitting voluntarily to a polygraph examination, especially if unrelated to the employee's position with an employer and administered by an entity other than the employer, would do little to promote the purposes of the bill.

- 3 -

Section 3(2), in its current form, would prohibit reference to, or the use of, any polygraph examination results for any purpose, without regard to whether the test was administered by an employer who seeks to rely on the information for employment purposes. As written, the bill could prohibit reliance on results obtained from a polygraph test legally administered by an agency with the authority to do so, such as a local law enforcement organization. As with Section 3(1), it is not clear that the stated purpose of the Act calls for this degree of restriction on the ability of employers to protect their interests.

We believe that Section 8 should be amended as suggested above and that consideration should be given to narrowing the breadth of Section 3. Otherwise, the Department of Justice interposes no objection to enactment of this legislation.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised this Department that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

Phillip D. Brady
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Office of Legislative and
Intergovernmental Affairs